

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 9, 15, 23, and 26-28 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants believe the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-8 and 20-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donovan et al. (6,012,032) in view of Misra et al. (6,189,146). The Examiner recognizes that Donovan et al. does not disclose checking if the service function is allowed by the storage system according to a usage constraint, and cites Misra et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7 as amended are patentable over Donovan et al. and Misra et al. because, for instance, they each recite checking if the service function is allowed by the storage system according to a usage constraint, wherein the usage constraint comprises a storage area needed by the service function and the service function is allowed if the storage area needed by the service function is under a preset value specified by the usage constraint.

Misra et al. merely discloses assigning a unique license pack ID to the license pack and associating the license pack ID with the particular license service in a master license database kept at the licensing clearinghouse. There is no teaching or suggestion of a usage constraint that comprises a storage area needed by the service function, wherein the service function is allowed if the storage area needed by the service function is under a preset value specified by the usage constraint.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 and 7, and claims 2-6 and 8 depending therefrom, respectively, are patentable.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 20 is patentable over Donovan et al. and Misra et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest using the storage area to perform the service function when the storage area added to a total storage area currently required by other users of the service function on the selected storage system does not exceed a predetermined total capacity for the service function on the selected storage system. As discussed above, Misra et al. is devoid of any teaching regarding storage area capacity.

Applicants respectfully contend that independent claim 21 is patentable over Donovan et al. and Misra et al. because, for instance, they fail to teach or suggest paying a given price for a selected limitation of the set, such that an actual number of users of the service function on the storage system and an actual total capacity of storage area used by the actual number of users does not exceed the selected limitation. Misra et al. does not disclose restricting usage based on total capacity of storage area. Therefore, claim 21 and claim 22 depending therefrom are patentable.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 23 is patentable over Donovan et al. and Misra et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest a license checking routine for receiving a customer request for the service function from the service provider system, and determining if the customer request is within a license limit, wherein the license limit has a plurality of combinations for the service function dependent on a number of users versus total storage capacity allowed for the number of users. Nothing in Misra et al. suggests a license limit having a plurality of combinations for the service function dependent on a number of users versus total storage capacity allowed for the number of users. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 23 and claims 24-25 depending therefrom are patentable.

Applicants respectfully contend that independent claim 26 is patentable over Donovan et al. and Misra et al. because, for instance, they do not disclose or suggest calculating a total area, including an area used by the new service function; and when the total area does not exceed a predetermined value, registering the new service function in the data management table for the user. Misra et al. fails to teach restricting usage based on total area used by the service functions. Thus, claim 26 is patentable.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 27 is patentable over Donovan et al. and Misra et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest checking if the service function is allowed by the storage system according to a usage constraint, wherein the usage constraint comprising a storage area needed by the service function and the service function is allowed if the storage area needed by the service function is under a preset value specified by the usage constraint, as discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 7.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 28 is patentable over Donovan et al. and Misra et al. because, for instance, they fail to disclose or suggest a license checking routine for receiving a customer request for the service function from the service provider system, and determining if the customer request is within a license limit, wherein the license limit has a plurality of combinations for the service function dependent on a number of users versus total storage capacity allowed for the number of users, as discussed above in connection with claim 23.

Claims 9-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donovan et al. in view of Glassman et al. (6,453,305). The Examiner acknowledges that Donovan et al. does not teach determining limit on a number of users, and cites Glassman et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 as amended is patentable over Donovan et al. and Glassman et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest a storage system comprising the plurality of service functions, wherein a service function of the plurality of service functions has a predetermined limit on a total capacity which is based on a number of the plurality of users that have access to the service function. Glassman et al. merely discloses restricting the number of consumers that can concurrently access the content on an open network. It is devoid of any teaching or suggestion related to a predetermined limit on a total capacity which is based on the number of the plurality of users that have access to the service function.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 9 and claims 10-14 depending therefrom are patentable.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 15 as amended is patentable over Donovan et al. and Glassman et al. because, for instance, they fail to disclose or suggest a user access information data structure indicating for a service function of the plurality of service functions selected users of the plurality of users that have access to the service function based on a total access capacity to the service function by the selected users, wherein the total access capacity is under a preset value for the service function. Nothing in Glassman et al. suggests

Appl. No. 09/886,350
Amdt. dated May 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2004

PATENT

restricting access to the service function based on a total access capacity to the service function by the selected users.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 15 and claims 16-19 depending therefrom are patentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Chun-Pok Leung
Reg. No. 41,405

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RL:rl
60212369 v1